THEOLOGY

VOL. LVII MAY, 1954 No. 407

Massing Priests

Is it possible to throw new light on the irrepressible demand for an amateur priesthood by trying to analyse the functions which fall to the lot of an anglican parson? As preacher and teacher he is (or ought to be) theologian; as pastor he is (in however distinct a sense) psychologist; as administrator and celebrant of the Eucharist he fulfils the primitive functions of deacon and bishop. Each of these five functions (for preaching and teaching are distinct) requires different charismata and different training. Each of them, except the last, could be a full-time, specialist, occupation. How can one man be expected to practise them all—except as a general practitioner with specialist advice readily available? The first need, in any attempt to reorganize the Church's ministry, is that these specialist functions within the one ministry should be recognized and the principle accepted that they can be fulfilled by ordination to specialist practice. At this point the medical analogy breaks down. For, while the ministry of healing is in itself a specialist profession and any further specialization must (rightly or wrongly) be based on prior qualification in general medicine and surgery, the ministry of the Church is precisely the ministry of the *whole* Church, delegated (whether by God or man is not here at issue) to individual members of the one Church. The only prior qualifications (the necessary charismata are assumed throughout this essay) are baptism and confirmation, on which can be based specialist ministries without the general training which is at present given in theological colleges.

The first three functions (preaching, teaching, spiritual guidance) normally require a specialist knowledge, followed by apprenticeship under a skilled master, which can be acquired only by formal book work; and ordination to such work would assume examination both of theoretical knowledge and practical aptitude. The contemporary trouble is that they are apparently rated so low by ecclesiastical authority (and by public opinion?) that it is much *easier* to become a lay-reader or a Sunday-school teacher, or even to set up as an amateur soul-saver, than to be duly authorized to administer the Church's affairs or to preside at the Eucharist—functions which, however sacred, require little if any academic knowledge and a practical aptitude which can be trained almost wholly in the experience of secular life. The man who can administer in the secular field can administer in the ecclesiastical; and the Church could find a new and vital leadership, as well as releasing her professional clergy for other tasks, if she would reinstate the diaconate in its primitive significance, make it clear that ordination to the administrative service carries no suggestion of suitability for other functions, and admit to it unpaid volunteers. If an early bishop required seven deacons, and Rome

seven times seven, surely Liverpool might have her seventy times seven?

Given a sufficient hierarchy of experience and control, the first four functions can be carried out by men of all ages. The President of the Eucharist is in a different category. He is at least an "elder"; St Paul would probably have called him an "overseer", though he is not a bishop in the modern understanding of the office. The Eucharist is the formal expression both of the offering by the Church of her whole life (and that of her individual members in every aspect) and of God's acceptance of, and sacramental giving to, that life, those lives. It is the effective symbol of God's gracious intercourse with man, and the Church's eucharistic offering, at every point of life and death. The president at the Lord's Supper is, by derivation, by definition, President also in the whole life of the congregation. Few young vicars would be accepted if this were recognized to be the true significance of their office—and perhaps not many of the older ones, if they have in their congregations men who have shown themselves, in secular life, to be the natural leaders of the community. These men will listen to the theologian; they may even accept pastoral advice from a youngster who knows his job. They are accepting the ministry of skills of which they themselves are largely ignorant. But why should they accept the Presidency of a man who, whether through youth or ineptitude, is far less able than themselves?

The priesthood as at present conceived is, in fact, incapable of exercising its own highest function: and that function is therefore largely unexercised. The Christian congregation ceases to exist outside the church building because it has forgotten the office of President. The celebrant of the mass—whatever his other qualifications and activities—is, after all, a mere massing priest because (through no fault of his own but through the negligence of centuries) the deeper significance of his office is lost and he cannot, in any case, fulfil it. The function of celebrating the Eucharist belongs to the office of President (and not *vice versa*); and presidents are chosen not by training in colleges but by proved worth. They must be as capable of guiding the affairs of the congregation as a chairman of local government is capable in his own sphere. Normally the office could be expected to be offered to men who, while outstanding in their profession, had shown themselves also to be men of humility and good churchmanship: and to have the qualities of voice and imagination necessary (after the minimum of training) to leaders of worship. It would be in essence (and not by mere expediency) a spare-time, non-stipendiary, office, though Vice-Presidents would be needed to share in the chairmanship of congregational activities, to assist at the Eucharist and to deputize in the absence, sickness or death of the President. Office in other branches of the ecclesiastical service need be no bar, but should be no special recommendation, to appointment as President (the normal civil servant does not expect to become Prime Minister). There need be no lower age limit; but it may be assumed that few men would qualify, even for a vice-presidency, at the age of twenty-four. Ordination would be specifically to the

presidency, and only when he had the necessary qualifications would the President be licensed also to engage in theological or pastoral activity. The presidents would be massing priests—but with this significant difference that, through their own secular occupation and through their presidency, in the full sense, of the congregation outside as well as within the church building, the mass would be seen as the activity of the whole Church, the essential focus of the total offering of the Church's life.

F. B. Welbourn.

Revisions of the Eucharistic Rite in the Anglican Communion—II

The Episcopal Church in U.S.A. has an excellent institution which the Church of England might well copy—a Standing Liturgical Commission whose business it is to consider all proposals for P.B. revision, to collate materials and to take note of new liturgical developments. This Commission reports a situation in marked contrast to that across the Canadian border. The number of matters referred to it by General Conventions, individual dioceses and groups representing "all regions and schools and parties in the Church, has now reached such a total", it reports, "that it is evident that there is a widespread and insistent demand for a general revision of the Prayer Book".[1]

The Commission has now put out five volumes of Prayer Book Studies and it is the fourth which is concerned with the Eucharistic Liturgy. This contains two chapters on the Origins of the Eucharist and the Evolution of the Great Rites, followed by three long chapters on the history of the B.C.P. in the Anglican Communion. Then follow six chapters in which the Anglican rites are considered in minute detail, and finally the proposed Liturgy. This is put out primarily for study, though the House of Bishops has recently given limited permission for its use (together with suggested revisions of other parts of the P.B.), so that the Church may have some opportunity of testing it in practice.

This document will have to receive the consideration and judgment of liturgical scholars, and it is safe to say, one imagines, that particularly in the historical section not a few liturgiological eyebrows will be raised. It is the rite itself which concerns us here.

The American Commission has made an interesting innovation at the beginning. It has grouped the first Long Exhortation (considerably shortened), the Ten Commandments in the shorter form and the Gospel Summary into an Act of Preparation for Communion, to which may be added the Confession, Comfortable Words and Absolution. An address may be included and the whole act take place "on any day preceding a stated Celebration of the Liturgy, and especially before the great Festivals". (The Exhortation and Ten Commandments may, however, replace the Kyries and Gloria in Excelsis in the Liturgy itself on Sundays in Lent and at other times.)

[1] *Prayer Book Studies*, vol. iv, Preface, p. iv.

The Liturgy for the Celebration of the Holy Eucharist and the Administration of Holy Communion (to give the rite its full title) begins with the Collect for Purity, thus following the common American practice of omitting the first Lord's Prayer. The Commission decided against the inclusion of the Preparation at the beginning and the Last Gospel at the end, on the wise ground that it is bad liturgical practice to adorn the Eucharistic rite proper with what are the private devotions of the sacred ministers. The Collect for Purity is followed by the Summary of the Commandments to which the threefold or ninefold Kyrie Eleison is provided as the response. The words "upon us" are retained in the light of Scottish experience which omitted them in 1912, but restored them in 1929. Both the cadence of the words and all existing musical settings, it is argued, require them.

The Gloria in Excelsis is restored to its 1549 position on the ground that, since it was displaced in 1552 as out of harmony with the sombre tones of the Decalogue, the removal of the latter from the Liturgy proper leaves place for the restoration of the Gloria to its traditional position. Its use is made obligatory in Festal seasons and on all Sundays except those in Advent and from Septuagesima to Palm Sunday inclusive.

Sensible rubrics specify sitting for the Epistle as well as standing for the Gospel and also require the Epistle to be read facing the people. The lections are announced without specifying the chapter and verse. The Creed is printed with the same changes as in the Indian book.

Ten Offertory sentences are provided, the first (as in the Canadian revision) being Ps. 50. 14, and 1 Chron. 29. 11 and 14 (as in the Indian and Canadian rites) may be said at the placing of the alms and oblations on the altar.

The traditional Prayer for the Church comes in for severe castigation from the Commission. It is "the least vital, incisive and stirring form of General Intercession in the Prayer Book".[1] The Commission meets the problem by allowing the use of a Litany or the American Bidding Prayer in its place and by a drastic shortening and rephrasing of the Prayer itself. The resultant prayer is only about three-quarters the length of the old, and even then all except the first and last paragraphs may be omitted on weekdays. The first paragraph is a good example of what is proposed.

> "Most merciful Father, we humbly beseech thee to accept our (*alms and*) oblations, and to receive these our prayers for the Universal Church: that thou wilt confirm it in the truth of thy holy faith, inspire it with unity and concord, and extend and prosper it throughout the world."

The Prayer follows other Anglican revisions in including prayer for the departed and a fuller Commemoration of Saints than in the present American book. The petition for the faithful departed is:

[1] Op. cit., p. 206.

> "We also commend unto thy mercy all thy servants departed this life in thy faith and fear: Grant them thy peace in the land of the living, where the light of thy countenance shineth upon them."

In the Penitential section the Confession is shortened by the omission of the clauses which speak of God's wrath and indignation against us and of the burden of our sins being intolerable. The Comfortable Words come *before* the Absolution, and 1 John 1. 9 replaces the traditional Johannine word. They are optional, except at the principal celebration of the Liturgy each Sunday.

The omissions in the Confession are justified on the ground that the phrases are "almost insuperably difficult to justify to the modern mind". They are regarded as "one of the very few infiltrations of contemporary medieval attitudes into Cranmer's work"—a somewhat startling statement in the light of his medieval concentration on the Cross and Passion and equation of sacrifice with death. The change in the last Comfortable Word is explained by the difficulty of rightly rendering the Greek word usually translated "propitiation" and by the fact that 1 John 1. 9 expresses more satisfactorily the purpose of the Confession and Absolution in the service, which is not just remission of sin's penalty, but also the actual overcoming of sin.

The Canon follows the same general pattern as that in the present American book. The various sections have titles—the Thanksgiving, Narrative of the Institution, the Oblation (Anamnesis), the Invocation and the Supplication (our Prayer of Oblation).

The exordium of the Prayer is Eucharistic and, like the Indian and Canadian proposals, includes a reference to the Incarnation. The most interesting change from the present American canon, however, is in the form of Invocation. Like the Indian Canon, this combines Western and Eastern usages, but it deliberately inverts the order, putting the reference to the altar on high before the Epiclesis. It also incorporates material from the Prayer of Oblation in compressed form, thus reducing the Supplication quite considerably in length.

> "And we most humbly beseech thee to accept upon thine altar on high this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, our bounden duty and service; and vouchsafe to bless and sanctify with thy Holy Spirit these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the most blessed Body and Blood of thy dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ."

The Fraction is made a distinct act after the saying of the Lord's Prayer and is followed by the Pax, the Benedictus, the Prayer of Humble Access and the Agnus Dei. The closing words of the Prayer of Humble Access avoid the theological incorrectness of the form in both the present American book and 1662 by saying

> "that our sinful souls and bodies may be made clean by his most precious Body and Blood, and that we may evermore dwell in him and he in us. Amen."

The Ablutions are ordered immediately after the Communion, and the practice of Reservation for the Sick and "others who, for weighty cause, could not be present" is given recognition in the same rubric. Final rubrics require the full Consecration Prayer with the consecration of both elements and fresh reception of the Sacrament in both kinds by the celebrant, if a second consecration is necessary. They also allow the practice of Intinction, a custom which is growing in the strongly hygiene-conscious United States. Disciplinary rubrics about unworthy communicants are also printed at the end of the service.

The service in its general order and planning has much to commend it. It is straightforward, indeed streamlined, and every effort has been made to eliminate duplications of thought and to keep the sweep of the service flowing uninterruptedly forward in terse, clear language understandable by the modern man. Many, accustomed to the rolling periods of Cranmer's English, may find the language too bald and will wonder whether the liberal optimism still surviving in American civilization has not been allowed to excise too easily some of the sterner sentences in the penitential section. But the revisers have certainly made us face the question whether in 1662 there is not too much duplication of thought and ideas, and there is no doubt that altogether they have produced an important volume. Its historical section is likely to prove distinctly controversial, but its careful study of every element in the Anglican Liturgies will merit consideration in any future revision of the Liturgy in any part of the Anglican Communion.

Lastly, we come to the N.S.K.K., the Anglican Church in Japan. For many years now the Japanese Church has had a Eucharistic rite with alternate Consecration Prayers—a shorter one which is a translation of 1662 and a longer one which is a translation of the fuller American prayer. This revision shows the Japanese Church coming down on the side of the longer Consecration Prayer.

After some simplified disciplinary rubrics and the printing of a modified version of the first Long Exhortation, the new Japanese rite, like the American revision, begins with an Act of Preparation for Holy Communion. The Lord's Prayer, Prayer for Purity, Ten Commandments, Lord's Summary, Confession, Absolution and Comfortable Words are grouped together in a service which may be said either the night before, or immediately preceding, the celebration of the Liturgy.

The Liturgy proper begins with the Lord's Prayer and Prayer for Purity (omitted if the preparatory service has just been said), threefold or ninefold Kyries in Japanese or Greek, and the Gloria in Excelsis.

After the Sermon the short Compline form of Confession and Absolution is provided (though this too is omitted if the preparatory service has just been said). The Offertory follows; the sentences are reduced to seven, the last being 1 Chron. 29. 14. A specific prayer for the offering of the bread and wine is provided:

"O Lord, we beseech thee to accept the Bread and Wine which thy servants offer, and to use it for the precious Sacrament which thou hast ordained. Amen."

The Prayer for the Church which follows includes petition for the faithful departed and a Commemoration of Saints. This Intercession immediately precedes the Canon. Eight new Proper Prefaces are provided and Benedictus qui venit follows the Sanctus, though a rubric allows it to be used after the Consecration Prayer, as in the Indian and American rites. The Consecration Prayer, unlike all other Anglican revisions, is substantially 1549 with the Epiclesis before the words of Institution. This is surely a retrograde step. The characteristic pattern of the Consecration Prayer in all the major Anglican revisions since 1764 (as in Eastern usage) is Trinitarian—it offers thanksgiving to the Father, recites the redeeming acts of the Son and prays for the blessing of the Holy Spirit. If it is desired to leave room open for the Western tradition about the moment of consecration, then surely the solution is to keep the Invocation at the usual place, but so word it that it is concerned only with worthy reception, as in the South African rite. One lack in this Consecration Prayer is the absence of reference to the Incarnation in the opening Eucharistic sentence. The Pax, Agnus Dei and Prayer for Humble Access precede the Communion, in which the words of administration are simply:

"The Body (Blood) of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given (shed) for thee."

This is a simple, straightforward rite, of which the distinctive features are the placing of penitential material before the Offertory and the placing of the Invocation in the 1549 position.

What main trends does an examination of these four rites reveal? First, we must note the interesting proposal in the American and Japanese rites to group the Decalogue and penitential matter together in an introductory Act of Preparation and the parallel proposal in the Indian book to allow the Preparation to be said aloud on weekdays and the later Confession and Absolution omitted. This raises a theological question. Do we come to the central action of the Eucharist and to the act of Communion in order that in it we may obtain remission of our sins and all other benefits of Christ's passion? Or do we come as already forgiven sinners to offer the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving and receive the sacramental gift of incorporation into the life of Christ? No doubt this is to put the antithesis too sharply. The Church lives in two worlds at once and the Christian must continue to mortify the members that are on the earth, even while he seeks the things that are above. But it is probable that our judgment on the question whether the Confession and Absolution should come before or after e.g. the Offertory will be determined by whether we find ourselves answering the first or second question with the stronger affirmative.

Secondly, it is significant that all four new rites make much of the Offertory. The sentences are drastically pruned of the 1662 financial

emphasis, and the offering of the bread and wine, as well as the alms, is made an integral part of the rite. This is all to the good, and it may be hoped that the American custom by which the congregation remains standing till after the elements and alms have been offered will spread elsewhere. There is little sense of a corporate activity in the way we go down on our knees like individual ninepins as soon as we have put our money in the alms bag.

Thirdly, the Intercession is retained in all four revisions at the 1662 place. Cranmer was certainly right, if only on grounds of excessive length, in separating it from the long Consecration Prayer, and, whatever view be taken about its ultimate place and character in the rite, we may be glad that none of the revisions follows the Scottish Liturgy in going back on his work at this point.

Fourthly, the Consecration Prayer in three out of the four revisions is linked directly to the Sanctus without the interruption of either the Benedictus or the Prayer of Humble Access. All four remove the latter to a place just before the Communion (which is much more suitable than the 1928 position); all four give the Consecration Prayer a Eucharistic exordium; three out of the four include thanksgiving for the Incarnation as well as for the Cross; all four include an Anamnesis with its emphasis on the Resurrection and Exaltation as well as on the Death of Christ, and so give that rounded recital of the whole redemptive activity of Christ which is one of the great lacks of 1662.

On the other hand, one of the four leaves the Prayer of Oblation in its 1662 position and thereby raises an important question. Should that prayer be restored *en bloc* to the Canon? Or should at any rate the clause that speaks of the offering of ourselves, our souls and bodies be retained in its present position after communion? Linton[1] urged that it should be so retained and Dix[2] suggested that the whole prayer would make an appropriate offertory prayer. There are arguments both ways, but it is important that the question be carefully considered, and not just taken for granted, in any further English revision.

What suggestions merit consideration, even though not adopted in any of the four rites? Perhaps two may be mentioned, which arise out of experience in St Augustine's College Chapel.

(1) If we are going to make specific mention of the Pax (in addition to its inclusion in the final blessing), should we not seriously consider placing it in its traditional Eastern position at the offertory? The Liturgy for India does this, and it is a moving moment when the Kiss of Peace is passed round the congregation before the central action of the Eucharist begins—though we should need some equivalent Anglo-Saxon action (hand-shaking?) for the form of hand-clasp used.

(2) The rites are equally divided between restoring the Gloria in Excelsis to its traditional position at the beginning, as in 1549, and leaving it in its present place. This reflects a division of feeling

[1] *Twenty-five Consecration Prayers*, p. 130.
[2] *The Shape of the Liturgy*, pp. 692–3 n.

among many worshippers. It is a splendid thing to start our worship with a hymn of praise. It is equally splendid to join in an act of thanksgiving after Communion—and there is no doubt that, whatever the pundits may say about the climax of Communion, the post-Communion falls flat if worshippers have not something they can say *together*.

Here again the Liturgy for India may have something to teach us. It provides those fine words from the Liturgy of St Basil, which sum up all that has gone before and which meet the need most satisfyingly. If it were finally decided to place the Gloria at the beginning of our rite or at least allow its use there, then these Eastern words might well be borrowed for our Western Liturgy, in the same spirit as Gregory the Great bade St Augustine to choose from every church those things that are pious, religious, and upright, and let the minds of the English be accustomed thereto.

> "Finished and perfected is the mystery of thy dispensation, as far as in us lies. We have made the memorial of thy Death, we have seen the symbol of thy Resurrection, we have been filled with thine inexhaustible bounty, and enriched with thine undying life; of the which do thou vouchsafe to count us worthy in the world to come, O Christ our God; to whom with thy Father eternal and thine all-holy and quickening Spirit be ascribed, as is most justly due, all praise and thanksgiving, now and ever, and world without end. Amen."

(*Concluded*)

C. Kenneth Sansbury.

American Letter: No. 18

POST-GRADUATE CLERGY TRAINING IN THE UNITED STATES

Our title is misleading inasmuch as we are concerned with but one phase of clergy education. Of course, as in Great Britain, any priest may avail himself of many opportunities for graduate study. The fifteen theological schools which prepare university graduates for the sacred ministry in the Episcopal Church are always ready to provide the means for advanced study to those clergy competent to undertake it. Moreover several of the greater universiteis—including Harvard, Yale, and Princeton—are splendidly equipped for this purpose. The late Archbishop Temple was fully aware of this when, on his final visit to the Republic, he spoke of *The College of Preachers* at Washington Cathedral as "one of the most outstanding and significant pieces of work ever done in the field of post-graduate clergy training in the Anglican Communion".

Thus the Archbishop was not thinking of theological colleges, nor of universities through which scholarly men might advance to higher degrees. He had in mind the practical training of the active parish clergy through intensive courses not only in theology, but in methods

of leadership in general: "refresher" courses through which wearied and harried parish priests are given "a breather". This sort of thing can be done effectually in periods lasting from a week to a fortnight. Though the daily hours of work are long, and the necessity for continuous concentration somewhat trying, attending clergy are always grateful for the opportunities afforded them. Rural priests have little time for study because of constant driving between widely separated stations and, when some time is available, poverty often prevents the buying of expensive books. Frequently an isolated parson does not see another for many months at a time, so he rejoices in the fellowship which the close association provides. So does the city priest as he enters upon this respite from the clamorous demands of the big parish. All clergy profit spiritually and intellectually by the devotional periods and the theological lectures, and quicky realize how necessary it is to be "brought up to date" in their divinity studies. Of course, practical homiletics—preaching the Gospel to the contemporary world—is given much consideration at both *The College of Preachers* at Washington and *The School of the Prophets* more than three thousand miles away in San Francisco.

The College of Preachers. In June 1927, in fulfilment of a constantly recurring hope of the Bishops of Washington, a Mr Alexander Smith made a gift of a million and a quarter dollars for the permanent establishment of "The College of Preachers". Bishop Freeman (1923–43) had spoken vividly about the need of adequately housing the annual conferences of clergy which met on the Cathedral close, and of turning them into a sort of "college" almost constantly in session. The great Cochrane gift now made this possible and in 1929 the present magnificent building was completed and dedicated. The College is under the jurisdiction of the Bishop, Dean and Chapter of the Washington Cathedral, but the actual administration and the choice and direction of the courses offered is in the hands of the Rev. Dr T. O. Wedel. Dr Wedel, a scholar of note and an author of distinction, has been singularly wise in his choice of subject matter to be taught and equally fortunate in his lecturers, not the least of whom was the late Archbishop Temple. Distinguished theologians, not only of the Anglican Communion but from other Christian bodies, have been teaching guests of the school in the offering of courses on such subjects as "Preaching the Doctrine of the Atonement", "The Theology of the Old Testament", "Preaching and the Social Problems of our Day", "Advent Preaching", "Preaching to Children".

These, of course, are but examples selected at random from a series of courses given to more than 3,000 priests meeting over the years in classes of from 16 to 20, and in which the whole field of theological and Biblical studies has been covered. It will be noted that the accent is always upon homiletics and the pastoral ministry. Men must learn how to transmute theological learning and the fruits of scholarship into the common thinking of ordinary people. Consequently, while the morning and evenings are devoted to lectures, the afternoons are spent in practice preaching under the criticism of the

Warden and his assistants. As the brochure issued by "The School of the Prophets" at San Francisco puts it, "The Gospel is a thing of flame. Thus the school strives to develop in its students a homiletical technique which will intrigue the minds and possess the hearts of the people with an adequate Biblical exegesis within their intellectual capacities. Our leaders are chosen because of their power to transmute spiritual experience into the speech of common men. Class discussion is uninhibited. Personal conference is the rule. The individual learns by practice, instruction, counsel, and companionship."

The School of the Prophets. From the above it should not be assumed that the one end of either of these schools is proficiency in preaching the Gospel of Redemption. The techniques of *pastoralia* are regarded as of immense importance, and both schools have frequent courses in these matters. Their libraries, from which the clergy may borrow freely by post, are well equipped with the best books on various phases of the pastoral ministry published on both sides of the sea. Despite current opinions to the contrary in England, great numbers of the American clergy are poorly paid and quite unable to buy expensive books or magazines. This, of course, is particularly true of the Missionary Dioceses, where the Church ministers to small populations thinly scattered over vast areas. For instance, the Diocese of Arizona covers 113,810 square miles inhabited by little more than 700,000 souls, of whom less than 7,000 are communicants of the Church served by fewer than 30 active priests! Naturally priests so lonely are less likely to sink into intellectual stagnation when books are so easily available, or to suffer a spiritual drought when on occasion they may experience the devotional disciplines of either of these schools.

The schedules of the two schools not only provide adequately for the corporate devotional life of those who attend, but at fairly frequent intervals arrange for complete sessions under the leadership of skilled and experienced leaders in this field. Matters of churchmanship have not clouded the picture: a monk may teach a group of priests who, at their last session, were led by an "old-fashioned Evangelical". At one meeting of the School of the Prophets Anglo-Catholics at first were stunned and then exalted by the spiritual counsels of a devout Quaker. Neither fully understood the other, but the priests soon confessed that for a space they had lived under the spell of a Saint. The lesson was a salutary one.

Lecturers, Subjects, and Disciplines. While the "College of Preachers" has a more intensive and more far-reaching program of courses and studies than is possible for the "School of the Prophets" with its very limited financial resources, an account of the proceedings of the latter may suffice.

In the "School of the Prophets", as in Washington, the day begins with an early Eucharist. Breakfast is followed by a thirty-minute period of Meditation led by a priest appointed for the purpose. At 10 o'clock lectures begin and continue until 12.30, when lunch is served. The afternoons, from 2 until 5, are devoted to preaching in

one of the Cathedral chapels, followed by criticism in the classroom led by the Warden or Assistant Warden, but in which all members of the school participate. After dinner, at 7.15, lectures are resumed. The day, obviously a heavy one, ends with Compline at 10.00. Despite this rush opportunity is provided for personal conferences with the leader of the session.

The broad range of subjects may be realized from the following list chosen at random from the records. The Bishop of Exeter, "Moral Theology". Professor Dillistone, "The Doctrine of the Atonement". Father Tiedemann, O.H.C., "The Life of Prayer". The Bishop of Nevada, "The Apologetic background of Contemporary Preaching". Professor Frederick C. Grant, "The Christian Doctrine of Salvation". Canon Frederick Hood, "Teaching the Faith to University Men". Among English lecturers we have had the Bishops of Ely and of Willesden, and the Chancellor of Lincoln. Professor Adolf Keller came to us from Switzerland, and the Archbishop of Moosonee from Canada. Courses in the ministry to the sick of mind as of body, in Christian Sociology, and in the correction of defects in speech have been given. Psychiatric problems within the range of the competent priest, and expert instruction in audio-visual educational methods, have added to the school's interest and usefulness. Of course the Bishop of California, Dr Block, and his suffragan, Bishop Shires, have also given notable courses: the latter on "The Theology of Karl Barth", the former on "Preaching to the Contemporary World". In addition to these, special training courses have been conducted for clergy whose work is primarily with university students.

It is of interest to note that, since its foundation in 1924, more than 3,000 clergy have attended the "College of Preachers" at Washington; that since 1938 more than 1,200 have been guests of the "School of the Prophets" at San Francisco. In both cases men are charged nothing for their rooms and meals . . . a blessing to men who, in order to visit either school, may have to travel 2,000 miles.

Eric Montizambert.

"The River Line"

A play by Charles Morgan, with a preface, "On Transcending the Age of Violence"

I have been surprised at a reference made to Mr Morgan's *River Line* by the Archbishop of York in his recent *The Church of England Today* (pp. 29–30). He says that in this play, "which had a deservedly long run, one of the characters, a young American teacher, abruptly asks an English girl with whom he is in love, 'Are you Christian?' She replies, 'Yes,' and the conversation continues on lines only intelligible between two people who hold in common the Christian standards." Now, I cannot for the life of me see one uniquely Christian trait in that succeeding conversation. What leads up to the question is perhaps more to the Archbishop's point, because it contains more philosophizing. But is it peculiarly Christian to say as

Philip does, "What I'm struggling for is some kind of reasoned balance between the activities and the acceptancies of life—the crusading part and the quietist part of me" (p. 45)? We get nearer to a Christian utterance in Valerie's distinction between indifferentism and "fighting in a part of the battlefield that no one will ever notice, or loving, not for what love takes or even for what it gives". But not even this distinction logically necessitates that question which so excited the Archbishop, "Are you Christian?"

Before investigating further how Christian the play is, let us look at the observations with which it abounds simply as words of general wisdom. I do not find that they search me very deeply. They have a certain clarity which perhaps helps to endear Mr Morgan's work to his great French audience, but they do not seem to have come out of the heat and stress of experience. Perhaps Mr Morgan might here say that it was precisely the violence of what I call experience that he was concerned to transcend. In his Preface (p. xvii), for example, he tells us that he did not wrestle with the difficult problem of how to make the "germ" of this work into a play, because he believes in waiting at doors which are locked, for, "if there is nothing on their other side that we are capable of receiving naturally and tranquilly, it is as well that they should remain shut". The key words are "naturally and tranquilly", and I suppose, therefore, we cannot be surprised to find that Mr Morgan's wisdom is not red-hot, for he never went into the fire.

The verses with which the opening pages of the printed play confront us are correspondingly two-dimensional, and trigger off no illuminating or disturbing reactions.

> If I but had the eyes and ears
> To read within what now appears,
> Then should I see in every face
> An innocent, interior grace,
> And. as the clouds of thought unfurled,
> Be native of the golden world.
>
> For not by thought shall I acquire
> Re-entrance to my heart's desire,
> Nor as a ticket-tourist come
> Out of exile to my own home.
>
> All things that are of Earth or Hell
> We gain or lose and buy or sell,
> But Heaven's deep-enclosed delight
> Is an hereditary right
> Which this man's lust nor that man's hate
> Nor my cold sin can alienate,
> But lives my own, when all else dies,
> Within my blood, within my eyes:
> So true it is that my dis-Grace
> Is absence from my Native Place.

Let us take a specimen four lines and examine them carefully. There is nothing very significant about

> For not by thought shall I acquire
> Re-entrance to my heart's desire

—plain, musical, straightforward, prose prettily versified. The next two lines are more interesting, first, because of an image which is,

at least superficially, apt and neatly turned, especially in the compound word "ticket-tourist", and secondly because of the rhythm of the line, "Out of exile to my own home", and the associations of *exile* and *home* which it would have been hard to have destroyed. But the propriety of the image and its real scope are questioned by a consideration of whether exiles ever do return home as tourists. If it be maintained that that is just the point and that exiles do not do so, then it must be asked how relevant the reference is anyway? Does the context not require rather an emphasis on the inability of the exile to buy his way home for good? an emphasis, that is, on the *ticket* element rather than on the *tourist*? My suspicion is that the poet has been led into irrelevance by love of the pretty compound word.

Such disquieting analysis of this verse sends us back with less confidence to the teaching of the play which is summarized in it. Here are many thoughts about life, an atmosphere of serious concern, but to what extent does this merely gratify our self-righteousness—rather like a calendar with daily "thoughts"—and, in a sense, merely add another piquant ingredient, though it may be the major one, to this sophisticated entertainment?

To compare Mr Morgan's *The Fountain* with the *River Line*, in this respect, is not altogether fair, for the philosophizing of the play has an immediate connexion with the plot, unlike that of the novel, and whereas the novel is thick and heavy with meditation and reflection, the play is, comparatively, sharp and terse. But it is not wholly irrelevant that, when I objected once to *The Fountain* on the grounds that I was not interested in a "mystical" justification of adultery, a friend told me I had missed my way—think, said he, how much more interesting adultery is to the feminine reader when mixed with the "mystical", and moreover, when it is offered not by a mere mystical adulterer but by an adulterous mystic. His wit perhaps exaggerated, but it cleared the pious air.

To what extent, then, does all this philosophical talk in the *River Line* build for us a vision of life which we can contemplate at length, and find stand the test of all our faculties as Christians? The Preface says that Heron, the exemplary character who had transcended the age of violence, "had reached a condition of interior equilibrium" (pp. xix–xx). Heron is, on the one hand, a man of action and an efficient officer who "recognized the perversions of society and fought against them". But on the other hand, "without withdrawal", by "looking in himself and in others for a peace within all wars and a sanity within all madness, he was not torn by our anxieties", and meets even unjust and precipitate death with serenity. He says that he is "quiet and included" (p. 89).

Our Lord taught us detachment in that he taught us, for example, not to be anxious for our material needs but to put our trust in the loving care of the Father, and not to cling to life but to be eager to lay it down that we may truly live. But our Lord himself was far from composed and serene on all occasions. He wept at the death of Lazarus whom he loved and at the sight of his sisters' tears. He

prayed with agonized physical intensity in the garden before his arrest that he might be spared the cross, but that the Father's will should be done; and from the Cross he cried out, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"

And if we ask if we can be so fortunate as Heron, if we ask to be taught his way, "if we ask how to live in the age of violence, certainly there is no answer that one man may give to another" (p. xxiv). This is cold comfort. How like the Christian gospel is this? If we gave this as our assessment of the human situation, would people be bound to ask us the question, "Are you Christian?"

Mr Morgan continues, "Our hope of deliverance is in the asking, and in being aware that it is a spiritual and personal, and not an economic or collective, question that we ask." The Christian rejoices to see this public assertion of the importance of the spiritual. But can the Christian happily allow the spiritual to be thus ranged with the personal against the collective? At the last day, doubtless, each person will stand before God to be judged as an individual, and it is for each of us as divided individuals of a fallen race that our Lord died. But it is reunited as members of his Body that we enjoy the benefits of his Passion. There is no purely personal Christianity. Christians may not cultivate their spiritual gardens for the sake of their own inner peace.

Nor will they ever enjoy such a fruit of the Holy Spirit until they have acknowledged with their whole being the objective reality and sovereignty of the law of God. But Mr Morgan, referring specifically to the duty that Heron did as an officer in escaping from his captors, says plainly, "We are weak, our minds are naturally discursive, and it is of help to us, in cultivating our garden, that it should not all lie open to the four winds of our pride, but be sheltered in part by certain absolutes which we accept and whose service may become our freedom" (p. xxiii). Much as this may resemble orthodox Christian teaching, its emphases and priorities are so awry that we can sympathize with it, if at all, only because it points somewhere in our direction and not wholly the other way. And again we cannot be happy when it is asserted that "the Kingdom of Heaven is within you" (p. 130), without a complementary and perhaps paradoxical assertion that God's purpose is to sum up all things in Christ Jesus.

The Christian will agree with Mr Morgan that inner peace is a "grace—that is to say, a gift that is not a bargain and is infinitely available to all men without their deserving". And he will agree that "we must be in a state to receive it. We create nothing; we receive all things" (p. xxi). But Mr Morgan at other times will talk of this interior grace as if it were something already there and needing only to shine through. Heron's words to the callow Frewer, answering his question about death, in referring to an interior grace are referring to more than peace within human beings. "In childhood it was a pretty steady light, though it grew more and more distant. Even now there are flashes of it when a tree or a sky or even a man or a woman becomes, as you look at them, in some way timeless, just as they were in childhood, and reality—a kind of interior grace—shines

through appearances" (p. 68 and cf. 94–5). This is a doctrine that reminds of Wordsworth's "Ode on Intimations of Immortality".

Its implications become clearer when we observe how what I think is part of the same doctrine is put in the opening poem:

> . . . Heaven's deep-enclosed delight
> Is an hereditary right
> Which this man's lust nor that man's hate
> Nor my cold sin can alienate,

and when we read in the preface the reference to our human predicament as one wherein we who are "men and women of peaceful mind nurtured in a rule of law derived from ancient Rome and tempered by Christian emphasis upon *each* man's inalienable worth and responsibility as the child of God, find ourselves in a world where great hordes have rejected, or have never learned, the traditions of Rome and of Christ, of Athens and of the Renaissance, and are determined to wipe away even the memory of them from the earth" (p. xvi). There speaks the humanist rather than the Christian, and a humanist who would appear to be unaware of the inner conflict that is an inherent characteristic of other fallen human beings, even if he himself is spared it. Two of the characters say that in wartime "things that used to be wild melodrama have become commonplaces" (p. 129)—which is true indeed. And when they go on to say that we then did things "right and inevitable on the plane of insane violence" but "dead against every intuition of our personal lives", we can see a half-truth and sympathize. But we must then pause and ask whether there are not inside most of us not only intuitions of good but also some springs of insane violence itself. Are not the intuitions of our personal lives frequently deceptive, blurred and distorted by the Fall? Do they not tend to selfishness, and bestiality? How frequently do they prove us, what it is true we were designed to be, the children of God?

On another occasion Philip speaks in much the same terms about "Hamlet's dilemma between a violent action required of him by—oh, by Destiny if you like, and the peaceful quietism that was part of his nature" (p. 40). These remarks about Hamlet have arisen in a conversation about Destiny and our inability to escape it. Marie says, "Our responsibilities within our destiny select us, not we them," and Mrs Muriven says earlier that America is learning fast and moving "in the direction of responsibility . . . responsibility *within your destiny*. Like a pilot's responsibility for his ship, moving on a tide" (p. 39). This introduces us to one of the main themes of the play, and we can see how it is related to the idea of inner peace, the interior grace, in Heron's remark that he is quiet and included, and his sister's that there was no question of his forgiving or not forgiving his murderers because he saw that the truth was that they in killing him "bore their responsibility in the predicament of the world" (p. 162).

This latter is a fine-sounding phrase, typical of Mr Morgan. It is in the class of "Transcending the age of violence" or the title of his book, "Liberties of the mind". And though I am suspicious of a

certain glib primness in these phrases, this is, of all the things said in the play, the one that speaks, as I believe the Quakers would say, most to my condition. The world is full of joy and wonder and there can be few of us who really want to be out of it. But living has some aspects of which it is only with amazing and dignified calm such as seems to characterize Mr Morgan that we refrain from using no stronger word than his "predicament". Living is so much a matter of misunderstandings that seem unavoidable, of demands for action where no course seems a good one, of irritations, plans gone awry, of embarrassments and of pain. And yet within this sort of a world we are called to do God's will, to keep our heads above water through his power within us, to serve him as we were originally meant to do. And, soaked and blinded as we may be by the black waters as we struggle against what appear to us to be God's enemies, we must keep our eyes constantly on him who is wholly "other" and on Heaven our true home. In the words of Mazzini, quoted by Mr Morgan on his title-page,

> We must act like men who have the enemy at their gates, and at the same time like men who are working for eternity.

That fine phrase of Mr Morgan's, then, about bearing our responsibility in the predicament of the world, is susceptible of an orthodox Christian interpretation. But I am by no means sure that Mr Morgan intended that. He nowhere seems to suggest, despite his references to what he calls grace, that supernatural intervention is at all necessary to enable human beings to bear their responsibility. Nor is our predicament as Mr Morgan presents it apparently related to that Cross whereon was triumphantly finished our Lord's life of perfect and sacrificial obedience, nor is our ability to bear our responsibility apparently related to the power of his inevitable reward in his Resurrection. The Christian can say, "I can do all things," but only "in him that strengtheneth me".

Nor does Mr Morgan appear to think that for forgiveness of sins we need go beyond a patient and mature waiting upon Fate. The relationship of this idea to that of bearing our responsibility in the predicament of the world appears in this passage from the preface. Philip, one of Heron's murderers, is praised because "when the facts are known to him he adjusts his ideas to them. He accepts personal responsibility for what he has done, though he did it under a misapprehension. . . . He recognizes that he is the active and responsible instrument as well as the victim of violence, and is prepared to do penance until such time as he receives absolution not from his own or from any human will, but, as a Greek might have said, from within the tragedy itself" (pp. xviii–xix). As the play nears its end more is said of this—"You have to bear responsibility for the wrong that came through you until you are . . . purified of it. Absolved" (p. 151). Earlier it has been asked whether "only the sins we commit knowingly are to be expiated and forgiven?" and it has been pointed out that "The whole of Greek tragedy denies it." Mr Mor-

gan's view of life is, to say the least, substantially that of the classical humanist rather than that of the orthodox Christian.

There is a connexion between this idea about sin and the idea of interior grace. In passing it must be said that the consistency of Mr Morgan's ideas throughout the play does, on the whole, stand the test of close scrutiny, and must be borne in mind in an assessment of his thought. Philip, then, says in one of the last speeches of the play, "The solution of tragedy, I suppose, can never come from outside, but only from a power within the tragedy itself" (p. 165). It would appear that Mr Morgan believes there to be sufficient for our salvation within the natural order itself, if only we can receive it. And what we need to receive it is wonder—that "is the grace to receive Grace" (p. 149). We are to prefer "the faculty of wonder before the faculty of sight" (p. 131). Now, true though it is that there is too little wonder in our urban and industrial civilization, and true though it is that some increase of it would be likely to make us more receptive of God's grace, at the same time it is Christian teaching that our salvation is through faith, not wonder. Perhaps, however, Mr Morgan has something to teach us here, for there is an element of wonder, to which this emphasis calls attention, in Peter's confession, "Thou art the Christ," and in Mary Magdalene's anointing of our Lord's feet. But their wonder was not at life and our human predicament but at the might and mercy of the Son of God, and their faith was not in any capacity within the tragic human situation to bring men peace and to transcend the violent world, but in the unmerited intervention in this world of a loving God, without whose incarnation, death, resurrection, and ascension, there would have been no end to human misery and sin.

R. T. Davies.

Hymnals and History

The influence of hymns can scarcely be exaggerated. It is said that the Brahmins, the conservators of the ancient Indian hymns, some of which date back to 600 B.C., could memorize every word of the vast number of lyrics and sacred poems, of which the Rig-Veda contained over a thousand examples.

The Church of England in particular owes much to hymn writers. There is a well-known story of Cardinal Manning, listening to an errand boy whistling "The Church's one foundation", and remarking to a companion "I wish we had popular hymns like that". Writers like Dr Neale, Canon Bright, and a host of others, have contributed to the wealth of hymnody which has found a place, though not an official place, in our worship.

The earliest hymn book in the Anglican Church would seem to have been the collection of psalms and metrical paraphrases by Sternhold and Hopkins. Sternhold was Groom of the Robes to Edward VI, and it is said that the king was so delighted with his verses that he encouraged the singer to collect and print them. Not all were equally impressed, for a satirist wrote—

Sternhold and Hopkins had great qualms
When they translated David's psalms
To make the heart right glad;
But had it been poor David's fate
To hear thee sing and then translate
By Jove! 'Twould make him mad.

"Tate and Brady" came out soon after the Prayer Book had been revised in 1662. The first hymn book, in our modern sense, was probably that of St James, Piccadilly, in 1697, but Dr C. H. Valentine in a learned article in THEOLOGY in July 1951 has unearthed an earlier example in Withers' *Hymns and Songs of the Church* in 1625.

In 1708 appeared *Lyra Davidica,* which contained some hymns which have become classic, e.g. "Jesus Christ is risen to-day". Various collections of hymns, mainly of an Evangelical cast, appeared during the eighteenth century, but were frowned upon by the clergy, e.g. by Isaac Williams, who disapproved of hymns, though he wrote the devotional little hymn, "Lord, in this thy mercy's day", which has retained its popularity and appears in most collections. Bishop Heber (1783–1826) protested against the undue familiarity with divine things which characterized the hymns of the Evangelical school, and wrote the hymn "Hosanna to the living Lord" as an example of a more worshipful type. He was rector of Hodnet, Salop, and a scholar of considerable attainments, and many of his hymns will live, e.g. "Holy, Holy, Holy", and "From Greenland's icy mountains", which latter he wrote in his garden on Whitsun Eve 1819, and, by some miraculous *tour de force,* was able to have ready for a missionary festival the following day! Heber displayed a liturgical sense in advance of his time, and planned a hymnal which should contain a series of "graduals" to be sung between the Epistle and Gospel, but the Archbishop of Canterbury would not authorize the project and it came to nothing. Among the contributors was Dean Milman (author of the fine hymn "Ride on, ride on in majesty"). He is said to have been the only Dean of St Paul's who had a play performed at Covent Garden.

This was as near as the Anglican Church ever got to compiling its own official hymn book, a project repeatedly urged by the late Dean of Wells, Dr R. H. Malden. It is true that a semi-official work, *Church Hymns,* was issued by S.P.C.K. in 1871, but the ground had been covered by so many collections, notably the immensely popular "Ancient and Modern", that it did not gain the circulation expected. It contains some good hymns, especially those by Bishop Walsham How and by the Rev. John Ellerton, its editor. He was rector of Barnes, and has a number of hymns to his credit, the favourite being "The day thou gavest"; the music of the first edition was largely by Sullivan, its musical editor, and reflects the rather unecclesiastical style then popular.

Murray's Hymnal (1852) and Denton's Hymnal about the same time were private collections, only used in the churches of their compilers. The latter introduced a new writer, the Rev. Sir Henry W. Baker, a Herefordshire vicar, later to be editor of *Hymns A. and M.* Many rural priests interested themselves in hymnology, among them

Chandler, a Surrey rector, and Mant, afterwards Bishop of Killaloe, who produced felicitous translations, many of which are still in use.

The *Savoy Hymnal* (1858) had some hymns by Dean Farrar. The *Church Hymn and Tune Book* came out in the same year: it was the work of the Rev. W. J. Blew, vicar of Gravesend, whose translations were of great merit. It had some of the earlier tunes by Dr Gauntlett, which attained considerable popularity. Gauntlett, like many composers, has suffered eclipse, but he was invariably tuneful, and some of his melodies, e.g. the familiar tunes to the Easter hymns "Jesus lives" and "Ye choirs of new Jerusalem", will not be superseded. Public schools sometimes produced their own books, and a great hymnologist was Benjamin Hall Kennedy of Shrewsbury, whose Latin Grammar was for long familiar to schoolboys. His translation of the fine hymn, "Boundless Spirit ever shedding", as "Genial Spirit, earth's emotion", has a decidedly pantheistic flavour!

The spate of hymnals of a definitely "Church" character provoked the publication of the Evangelical *Hymnal Companion* under the editorship of E. H. Bickersteth, vicar of Christ Church, Hampstead, and later Bishop of Exeter. It was an excellent book for its period, and some of its editor's hymns, e.g. "Peace, perfect peace", have passed into many collections.

Mercer's *Church Psalter and Hymnbook*, by a Sheffield vicar, appeared in 1854 and had for its musical editor Sir John Goss. The Irish public school, St Columba's College, Rathfarnham, provided a hymnal of its own which had some good melodies by Macfarren and others. A. R. Reinagle, an Austrian who had settled in England and was organist of St Peter-in-the-East, Oxford, published a collection of tunes about this time; one of them certainly will live, that to "How sweet the Name of Jesus sounds".

Two adjoining South London churches had their own hymn books: a little church, now pulled down, St James's, Kennington, was responsible for *The Appendix Hymnal*, while its neighbour, St John's, Waterloo Road, brought out a larger work in 1868, entitled *The English Hymnal*. Hard by, at St Mary's, Newington, the Rev. W. D. Maclagan, later to be Archbishop of York, was writing a number of hymns which have become favourites, e.g. "Bread of heaven", and next door the vicar of St Paul's, Lorrimore Square, issued a supplement of hymns with stirring tunes by the Rev. J. Baden Powell, in which the ever-popular "Hail, festal day" made its first appearance.

Canon Potts of Sonning and Dr Woodford of Leeds (later Bishop of Ely) were among priests who produced compilations of their own, both of some merit; Dr Woodford's translation of the rhythm of St Thomas Aquinas' "Thee we adore", has found its way into many books.

A layman, W. Chatterton Dix, edited a book of hymns for children, which included the favourite Epiphany hymn, "As with gladness". The Rev. James Skinner of Newland, a scholarly Tractarian, brought out a Daily Service Book in 1861 which included a number of liturgical hymns for weekdays and holy days.

"Puseyite" churches used the *Hymnal Noted*, an admirable collection which included about a hundred translations by Dr Neale: it had the ancient melodies to the Office hymns, and congregations picked them up surprisingly well. Neale was a prince of translators. It is not always easy to distinguish between his translations and his original compositions. "The foe behind, the deep before", and "Art thou weary, art thou languid?" are rather paraphrases than translations. The Ember hymn "Christ is gone up" was written for St Matthias' Day, and is a model of what a teaching hymn should be.

Neale also translated and collected carols, ballads, etc. One of his books of verses bore the quaint title *Songs and Ballads for Manufacturers*: another *Songs and Ballads for the People*. This latter contained a scathing attack on teetotallers! "Good King Wenceslas" is probably his worst carol, and the melody to which he attached it really belongs to a springtime carol, "Tempus adest floridum".

The Hymnary in 1872 was the hymnbook of St Andrew's, Well Street, the vicar of which was the compiler, the Rev. Sir Joseph Barnby was musical editor. It was on definitely liturgical lines, making provision for office-hymns, etc., though usually providing these with modern tunes.

Hymns A. and M. in course of time superseded all others, but for a long while the *People's Hymnal* seriously challenged it. This was a work compiled by Dr Littledale in 1867, but it had no melodies. Littledale ought not to be forgotten: he was a brilliant scholar, a versatile writer and journalist and something of a poet. He usually wrote over the signature "A. L. P." (a London priest) or "P. C. E." (priest of the Church of England).

There were many smaller hymn books, one of the most interesting being the hymnal of St Ethelburga's, Bishopsgate, where the rector, Mr Rodwell, was a noted oriental scholar. He broke new ground by translating oriental hymns.

The Rev. R. R. Chope, vicar of St Augustine's, Queen's Gate, published a large and not very discriminating collection of carols, and also edited a hymn book for the use of his people. Many churches had their own supplements, e.g. St Mary Magdalene, Munster Square, from which subsequent publications have drawn. The best of all the "unofficial" selections is, beyond question, Dr Woodward's *Songs of Syon*.

Many more writers, translators, and adapters deserve mention—Meultrie, Buckell, Copeland, Caswell, Chatfield and in more recent times, Dr Dearmer, T. A. Lacey and Athelstan Riley.

The scientific study of hymns and their origins was fostered by the monumental *Dictionary of Hymnology*, by Dr Julian, a scholarly Yorkshire vicar, assisted by a team of contributors whose researches unearthed much interesting information. Space does not allow of more than mention of the *Oxford Hymn-book*, the *New Office Hymn-book*, *Songs of Praise*, and the *B.B.C. Hymn-book*, but it is unlikely that any of them will displace the new *Ancient and Modern* and the *English Hymnal*.

MARCUS DONOVAN.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. F. B. Welbourn is Chaplain and Tutor at Makerere College, Uganda.

The Rev. C. K. Sansbury is Warden of St Augustine's College, Canterbury.

The Rev. Eric Montizambert is Canon of Grace Cathedral, San Francisco, and Warden of the School of the Prophets.

Mr. R. T. Davies is a Lecturer in English Literature in the University of Liverpool.

The Rev. Marcus Donovan is Vicar of Benhilton.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

I have been not a little surprised, on reading Mr T. S. Garrett's review in THEOLOGY (February 1954) of what I wrote in the work *Problèmes de l'Unité chrétienne* about the Lund Conference, to see ascribed to me as a conclusion "a somewhat complacent rejection of any hope that there will occur positive results to-day or to-morrow". I am, to be sure, not alone in not expecting the big Ecumenical Conferences to produce substantial results in the way of Unity in the near future. But to say that I regard this fact with any complacency is to credit me quite wantonly with a feeling which everything I have so far written on ecumental work—and particularly in the pages in question—contradicts, I trust, sufficiently.

Another point in the same review has pained me. Silence as an argument is, in history, a difficult argument to deal with. It is true that, in the work reviewed, the Younger Churches receive only scant attention. It would be regrettable if your readers drew from that fact the conclusion that I took, personally, no interest in so important an aspect of the ecumenical problem. It ought not to have escaped the critic (see op. cit., p. 7, footnote) that these pages are only an extract from a more exhaustive report published in the bulletin "Vers l'Unité chrétienne", a report in which a long paragraph is devoted to the "Impatience of the Younger Churches", and whose tone is not precisely that of a "joke". If one encounters in it as well the expression "enfants terribles de l'Oecuménisme", it is certainly not meant in derision—no more, I feel convinced, than it is under the pen of Chanoine Aubert. The expression, in my own mind, conjures up a vivid mental picture and is, it seems to me, fairly characteristic of the rather abrupt manner in which the representatives of the Younger Churches at Lund emphasized the unfortunate consequences of the divisions of the historic Churches and of their reluctance to accept conciliatory solutions, all such things over which others readily throw a prudish veil. Consequently, it should not in the least be taken as a "sobriquet". Were it one, I should have

been among the first to understand the Younger Churches' taking pride in it. The impatience of the Younger Churches, at certain conditions, however, which I cannot state here, can and must be a beneficent impatience.

Yours sincerely,

C.-J. DUMONT, O.P.

CENTRE D'ÉTUDES "ISTINA",
25, BOULEVARD D'AUTEUIL,
BOULOGNE-SUR-SEINE.

F. D. MAURICE AND THE REVISION OF THE CANONS

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Writing in 1841 to Archdeacon Hare about the danger of the revival of Convocation, F. D. Maurice uses words full of warning for 1954.

> "By the blessed decree that we should be left without a legislature . . . the Church has been left *to its own internal Sacramental life sustained by the forms of other days* without becoming . . . *hopelessly subjected to the notions of any one time.*"

The italics in this quotation are mine. The italics in the letter are not mine, but his, and merit serious attention. The letter in question reads as follows:

BLACKHEATH, *Tuesday, Aug.* 17, 1841.

MY DEAR HARE,

I used to have some dreams about the possibility of reviving the Convocation, and to feel rather harshly towards the sovereign who acted Oliver Cromwell to it. But the more I have reflected upon the past and present condition of the Church, the more I have become convinced that that sovereign was one of its nursing fathers, and that we cannot do better than profit by his benevolent and divinely-ordered interposition. Think what it would have been to have had a Convocation sitting during the last hundred and twenty years. The formularies would have been gradually Socinianized till the beginning of the reign of George III.; after that there would have been a (so called) High Church movement to erase from them everything that savoured of Methodism; a few years ago there would have been a strong and successful effort of Liberals and Evangelicals combined to cure them of their Catholic peculiarities; now there would be a tremendous struggle, either to accomplish that purpose or else to make them witnesses for a Catholic *system*, which I hold to be one of the greatest enemies of the Catholic *Church*. All these disputes, one after another, the statesmen would have encouraged, to keep you from meddling with matter more concerning them, and to make the Church feeble and ridiculous. By the blessed decree that we should be left without a legislature all these evils have been averted, and the Church has been left to its own internal sacramental life, sustained by the forms of other days without becoming subjected—hopelessly subjected, I mean—to the notions of any one time. Evangelical and Catholic principles have been each discovered in her, and asserted, as the time required them; Evangelical and Catholic systems have tried to enslave her, but have been broken in pieces against each other.

Even if the Convocation should find out that it existed only to impose taxes on the clergy—which I fancy is the true idea of it—I cannot think that in a day when Blomfield (Bishop of London) is virtually their ruler, this office could be performed with any safety to that which is abidingly meant for the good of future generations. Everything would be sacrificed to the tastes, fears, or apparent advantages of the moment.

Your plan of a meeting of archdeacons is quite of a different kind, because it would assume no authority, and would only be for discussion and suggestion. I should think it ought to be very useful.

These prophetic words of "F. D. M." need no commentary.

R. O. Hall,
Bishop of Hong Kong.

(P.S.—The letter is to be found in F. D. Maurice, *Life and Letters*, Vol. I, pp. 308–9.)

THEOLOGY IN SCHOOLS AND UNIVERSITIES

To the Editor of Theology.

Sir,

While Mr Melinsky is correct when he says (in the March number of Theology) that few universities offer for competition entrance scholarships in divinity, he and other divinity teachers may care to know that it is by no means impossible for promising grammar school pupils to gain an award in this subject. For instance, here at the University College of North Wales, Bangor, biblical studies may be offered at the entrance scholarship examination in arts; and it would appear from the entrance scholarship regulations of some of the other newer universities where there is a theological department in the faculty of arts that religious knowledge could be taken. There are also scholarships at St John's and Pembroke Colleges, Cambridge, in the examination for which New Testament Greek may be offered. It should be borne in mind, too, that most undergraduates come up to the universities with L.E.A. awards made in respect of their performance at the advanced level examination of the G.C.E.; and there is no reason why divinity should not be taken as one of the advanced level subjects by some of the good university entrants who are not of entrance scholarship calibre. Religious knowledge may also be taken at the scholarship level of G.C.E.

There is, however, a not inconsiderable objection to encouraging the institution of entrance scholarships in divinity on the lines, say, of those in classics, history, mathematics, etc., at Oxford and Cambridge. The study of theology at the university, like that of philosophy, economics, or medicine, must presuppose a school grounding in those disciplines which provide an adequate general educational background or some of the essential tools of theological study. It is most undesirable that the divinity specialist should have started his specialism too early in his educational career. What are perhaps needed in preference to entrance scholarships in divinity are more entrance scholarships in arts (or, even, in science) which are earmarked for candidates who intend reading theology at the universities.

Yours, etc.,

D. W. Gundry,
Warden of Reichel Hall and Lecturer in the History of Religions, University College of North Wales, Bangor.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

The letter in your February issue from our former neighbour, the Rev. A. H. Dammers, and the subsequent correspondence raised issues in which we are actively and intimately concerned. Like many a professional man in days when the field of knowledge has been so rapidly and so widely extended, he has urged that to counter professional ignorance more training of a specialized professional nature should be put, down a step in the ladder, into the schools.

In the past it has been felt regrettable to isolate ordinands at too early a stage; and often they have been urged to prove themselves and train their minds at the University in the secular discipline for which they have an aptitude. In these days there may well be less in this argument than there was: but however manifold the ramifications of theological studies, we cannot feel that a theological Sixth at schools would give the desirable propaideutic. B. F. Westcott, J. B. Lightfoot, and E. W. Benson, were once at this school under James Prince Lee : we question whether their contribution to sacred learning would have been greater had they pursued a more vocational course at school.

A danger of a theological Sixth is to be seen in what might be called the "seminarist" attitude. We are keen—and so are many of our lay colleagues—to present the Christian faith with no less skill than the special subjects of our degrees, but we should view with misgiving any step to narrow the education of would-be theologians.

Apart from the practical difficulties connected with man power, staffing ratio, and the universities' attitude to an Advanced level Pass in Scripture, there is the more profound educational question: Can philosophical method be a suitable discipline for Sixth Forms? Our job as we see it is to train young minds to a consciousness of the Bible view of life (in this connexion we are finding the S.P.C.K. pamphlet *The Bible*, by a former member of this school, the Rev. C. F. Evans, very useful). But we surmise that theology, professionally treated in schools, is like running before you can walk.

But what in fact does theology comprise? At the end of a theological course papers are generally set on the Bible, Christian Doctrine, Church History, Ethics, and Pastoralia. Of these all except Pastoralia are suitable for study, and are in fact studied, at school, though at present unsystematically and all too briefly. Gone perhaps are the days when a lesson by Arnold in Thucydides was a demonstration of the Christian view of man: but it is not necessarily true that secular studies—particularly the Classics—are valueless from the point of view of Christian theology.

We should above all like to see more room made in our overcrowded time-tables for the disciplined and regular study of the Bible. Christian doctrine, as handled for instance by Dr C. S. Lewis, is greatly appreciated, even if the Christological heresies that make up so much of early Church history seem to our boys utterly remote. But it is good to thrash out doctrinal topics in a mixed group con-

taining boys of various degrees of belief and various backgrounds and denominations.

Doctrine must always be related to current doubts and difficulties. Courses on Doctrine can too easily become discourses on the history of Doctrine; it seems to us far more important to discover from a study of the Epistles what the Atonement as a living truth meant to St Paul than to make neat summaries of Anselm's or of Abelard's theory of it. There is a shortage of suitable books for Sixth Forms in Christian ethics and in Church History. But we regularly read with profit Edwyn Bevan's masterpiece, *Christianity*.

It seems to us educationally unsound to treat theology as an "umbrella" subject comprising language, philosophy, architecture, anthropology, etc.: it is all too easy to let what is designed as a Christian instruction become a study of paleography, comparative religion, religious art—and so on through the list of "Christianity and ——" against which Dr Lewis has warned us. Even the reading of the Greek Testament can get no further than linguistic study, and fail to confront a boy with God.

Finally, we are not among those who lament the passing of "Divvers". But at the same time we should very profoundly regret the passing of the Divinity lessons which are now part of the program of all Sixth Forms (as of course of all others). The elevation of Theology into a major option might lead to its being treated like, for instance, Physics—something boys did in the Sixth Form only if they chose to. The creation of open awards in theology at the ancient universities is not a sure means to raise numbers in the theological faculties. When the teaching in them has been inspiring we recall that they have aroused a following—not necessarily of full-time theologians—no less than that noticed at Marburg.

Yours, etc.,

Ronald Lunt, *Chief Master.*
F. J. Williams, *Chaplain.*

King Edward's School,
Birmingham.

[This correspondence is now closed.—Ed. Theology.]

BOOK REVIEWS

Prophecy and Papacy—A Study of Lamennais, the Church, and the Revolution. By Alec R. Vidler. S.C.M. Press. 25s.

The Abbé Félicité de Lamennais (1752–1854), who died on 27 February 1854, is the most significant figure produced by the Roman Catholic Church in France for at least two hundred years. One of his two principal biographers, the Abbé Boutard, has said of him that his life was a drama in which the history of a whole century was concentrated. The most recent French historian of the church in modern France, M. Adrien Dansette, ranks him with Karl Marx as "one of the two great visionaries of the nineteenth century", and Dr Vidler does not hesitate to claim that "in his personality and accomplishments" he was "one of the most remarkable men that ever lived . . .

he was much more than a master of literary style. He was the founder, if anyone was, of modern ultramontanism and of liberal catholicism, and perhaps of christian socialism, while he was pronounced to be an heresiarch and an apostate by a church that has since appeared to adopt many of his ideas." It is, therefore, not a little surprising that only one book, published in 1896, and two essays of any substance have been devoted to him by English writers within the last sixty years. The publication in this centenary year, in an extended form and with a wealth of scholarly footnotes, of Dr Vidler's Birkbeck Lectures delivered in Cambridge in 1953 is indeed to be welcomed.

Dr Vidler's book is a historical study but not a biography. The author is concerned with the details of Lamennais's career only in so far as they are significant for the history of the church and for the problem of its relation to the French Revolution and its consequences; and therefore he has little or nothing to say of the last eighteen years of his subject's life. His story is of Lamennais's upbringing, his conversion, his priesthood, the development of his ideas—the new apologetics of traditionalism and the philosophy of *sensus communis*, his ultramontanism and his liberalism, the liberalism of the *Avenir* which led to the final crises of condemnation by Rome and his eventual abandonment of the church. As such it is admirably clear both in its narrative and in its analysis of the mennaisian ideas. Dr Vidler has had access to the fine collection of mennaisian literature and manuscripts at the Jersey house of the Frères de l'Instruction Chrétienne de Ploërmel (a fraternity founded by Lamennais's brother Jean) and he has made good use of the work done in the present century by French scholars in the Vatican archives. Moreover, he has been able to correct or supply much of the documentation which was faulty or lacking in the two chief French biographies, so that his book is a valuable contribution to mennaisian scholarship as well as a luminous account for English readers of one of the most dramatic careers in church history.

The dominant problem illustrated by this career is indicated by the title of Dr Vidler's work: it is the problem of "the tension that is perennial in ecclesiastical history between 'the priest' and 'the prophet' ". Lamennais's break with the church subsequently led some to suggest that he had no true vocation for the priesthood and should never have been ordained; but Dr Vidler points out that the period from 1816 to 1833 was "that of his most happy and fruitful activity, and it may be that his personal tragedy lay not in his exercise of the priesthood before his rupture with the church but in the prevention of his continued exercise of it afterwards". However this may be, he suggests that perhaps the problem of Lamennais's ordination should be differently stated: "Perhaps the most important question that Lamennais's career as a priest raises is whether it is consistent with the office of priesthood in the Church of Rome—and, maybe, in other churches too—to be an outspoken prophet and an initiator of radical reforms." And again, he writes, "There may be instruction and warning for all churches—for their advance-guards as well as for their hierarchies—in the encounter between

Lamennais and Gregory XVI, since scarcely any two figures in the history of the church have exemplified more clearly the distinction between the prophet and the priest. This was an encounter not between a bad priest and a good prophet, but between a good priest and a good prophet, who at the same time displayed the characteristic shortcomings of priest and prophet respectively." It was unfortunate that Leo XII had died before Lamennais and his fellow-pilgrims went to Rome to seek a decision on the teachings of the *Avenir*, for, as Dr Vidler suggests, he or another Pope less rigid than Gregory XVI might have handled the affair in such a way as to avoid a positive condemnation. Yet one wonders how long even a much more supple Pontiff than Gregory could, in the ecclesiastical and political climate of the 'thirties and 'forties, have kept in harness a prophet so bent on the regeneration of society as Lamennais. For, as Dr Vidler brings out so well in his epilogue, it was his passionate care for the spiritual and moral health of society that supplied a fundamental consistency of purpose beneath Lamennais's many changes of front, a care which continued to the end long after he had left the church, a lonely rebel.

An Irish writer, cited by Dr Vidler, wrote recently that Lamennais was "the greatest individual loss which the Church has sustained for four hundred years". This may well be true, yet it does not invalidate Lord Acton's view that "the fall of Lamennais, however impressive as a warning, is of no great historical importance; for he carried no one with him, and his favourite disciples became the ablest defenders of Catholicism in France". Lamennais *was* a lonely rebel—his great work was done within the church and not outside it. The seeds were sown before 1834, but under the cold blasts of *Mirari vos* and *Singulari nos* it was to be long before some of them would shoot again. Indeed, after a glance at Spain and South America, Dr Vidler concludes that, in spite of the wide currency of works infused with a mennaisian spirit such as those by M. Maritain, "the question of the present acceptance of Lamennais's ideas by the church is far from closed, and there is scope here for much further inquiry".

Dr Vidler's book is singularly free from inaccuracies and often deftly corrects the slips of others. I would only question his use of the term *ancien régime*—it is doubtful whether even the Ultras wanted or at any rate thought feasible anything like a return to the *ancien régime* in the full sense of the term—and I suspect that the date in footnote 59 on p. 33 should be 1805, not 1905.

Corpus Christi College, J. P. T. Bury.
Cambridge.

Sacrifice in Greek and Roman Religions and Early Judaism. By Royden Keith Yerkes. Adam and Charles Black. 18s.

The book was first published by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, in 1952, and consists of the 1951 Hale Lectures delivered at the Seabury-Western (Episcopalian) Seminary of Evanston, Illinois. They are the fruit of a lifetime of interest in the subject of sacrifice,

and consist of a selection of notes, made by a busy man during a busy life, from a mass of material, selected to give a bird's-eye view of the subject, and leading on to a more thorough pursuit of it.

Within its compass, the book is interesting, informative, and always pleasant to read. The author makes no pretence of producing a scholarly work of the type of Buchanan Gray's *Sacrifice in the Old Testament*, but he has certainly accomplished what he set out to do.

The book opens with a praiseworthy attempt to define the word "sacrifice", all the more welcome because many writers are careless in their use of the word, so that in their discussions they go into the mist meaning one thing, and come out of it meaning another. He is very clear that the original connotation was any ceremonial act to or in the name of a god, and that later the word might refer to the thing upon which the act was centred. The first fifty pages deal with the origin of religion. They are based on the work of Tylor and Frazer, but the author differs from Frazer in always being aware of the differences. He realizes that a rite in one tradition may have a wholly different meaning from a closely similar rite in another tradition. This realization is an example of a healthy and proper use of the evidence such as is not always to be observed in students of comparative religion. The outstanding example adduced is that of the holocaust, which amongst the Greeks was a gruesome, aversive rite, but amongst the Hebrews an expression of great joy.

The author gives details of the main sacrifices in Roman and Greek religion, dealing particularly with the Greek *thusia*, and then turns to the Hebrew pre-exilic and the Jewish post-exilic sacrifices. He holds that the holocaust ("burnt offering") was the highest development of Jewish worship, accepting Robertson Smith's idea that the original sacrifices were essentially communal meals. When true monotheism developed, the God could no longer share, so that the *'olah* (*sic*), the whole burnt offering, developed. The author here follows the generally accepted Tylor-Frazer scheme of the development of monotheism, but if, as some of us now hold, monotheism "never came out of that sort of thing", there is no reason to play down the early use of the term *'olah*, parallel to the use of the term *zebach*.

The concluding chapter deals with "The Christian Sacrifice". It is a great pity that this chapter is so condensed, but the author hopes to develop this theme in a later volume. Meanwhile, what is said emphasizes the early thought of "The Lord's Banquet" as a joyful thanksgiving culminating in a *thusia*, involving the sacred participation in our Lord's humanity. We hope the author will indeed develop his theme of the last chapter in a second volume.

N. H. Snaith.

Wesley College,
Leeds.

Origen's Doctrine of Tradition. By R. P. C. Hanson. S.P.C.K. 25s.

In his preface Dr Hanson affirms that "as far as English scholarship is concerned, Origen is almost unexplored territory". This sad state

of affairs he would remedy with the volume under review which is offered as a preliminary to a larger examination of Origen's treatment of Scripture. After an elaborate and at times adventurous discussion of the dates of Origen's works and the chief events of his life, Dr Hanson reports on some recent attempts to define "tradition". We revert to prolegomena with a brief section on Origen's translators concerning whose reliability Dr Hanson would disseminate doubt and suspicion. It seems that he can quote only very few modern scholars who have not adopted an uncritical attitude to Rufinus and Jerome.

Both Clement and Origen speak of esoteric doctrines which are understood and appreciated by the more intellectual Christians. Examination of the passages where Origen speaks of these doctrines shows that he did not think of them as authenticated by a tradition imparting information not found in the Bible, but only as derived either directly from Scripture or from the right method of interpreting it, i.e. by allegory and the anagogical method. A similar but not quite identical view is found in Clement, who emphasizes (as Origen does not) the unwritten character of tradition and uses language indicating that he thinks it has come down to him independent of the Bible. Statements of doctrine, however, which Clement regards as validated by this oral tradition consist of typically Alexandrian speculations "which we cannot possibly imagine to have emanated from our Lord or his apostles". Dr Hanson accordingly remains sceptical of the value of Clement's claim. The Bible, and the Bible only, is the religion of Origen in theory and of Clement, if not in theory, at least in practice.

The last paragraph of the book brings out the point that Clement as a man of the second century had to reckon seriously with the possibility of oral tradition independent of the Bible. To Origen in the third century the divine revelation is completely enshrined in the Scriptures; the Word, he says, "is as it were embodied in a book". Oral tradition is not seriously taken into account. This observation leads to wider reflections which may allow us to hope that Dr Hanson may be able to extend his inquiries beyond the Alexandrians to a more general survey of the media of revelation in the thought of the second and third centuries.

In the second century revelation is not universally regarded as being enshrined wholly in the Old and New Testaments. For example, a bishop of the early second century can remark that he values oral traditions of the words of the apostles more highly than written documents. And it is surely significant that Celsus, the pagan critic of Christianity, writing probably in the late seventies of the second century, does not argue that discrepancies and contradictions in the Bible invalidate any Christian claim (of which he is unaware) that it has the status of infallible revelation. In replying to Celsus Origen comments that when Celsus mentions the genealogy of Christ, he has stupidly failed to see that Matthew and Luke do not agree; he does not know the really good arguments against Christianity. Very different is the position late in the third century when the

identification of the Bible with revelation has become virtually absolute. Much of Porphyry's attack on Christianity is devoted to discrediting the infallibility of Scripture, and arguing, for example, the Maccabean date for the Book of Daniel.

Dr Hanson will not command universal assent to all his statements and inferences. Some readers may retain doubts that the neoplatonist Origen mentioned in Porphyry's *Life of Plotinus* is so easily to be identified with the great Christian exegete; that Eustathius, bishop of Antioch, 324–326 or 327, was attacking Origen's allegories in 254 (p. 7); that Origen's commentary on Revelation was both earlier and later than his commentary on Romans (pp. 14 and 18); that Clement describes Pantaenus as a Sicilian (p. 54); and that the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* is quoted in Origen, *c. Cels.* V. 61 (p. 139).

But this study will prove of value in provoking discussion and reconsideration of Origen, and all will wish Dr Hanson success in his plea for a renewed study of the very important questions raised in his book.

Queens' College,
Cambridge.

H. Chadwick.

A History of Philosophy. By Frederick Copleston, S.J. Vol. III, Ockham to Suárez. Burns Oates. 30s.

After an interval of three years since the publication of his second volume, in which his account of the history of European philosophy was brought down to Duns Scotus, Fr Copleston now continues the story from Ockham, the last great medieval schoolman, through the period of the Renaissance, to Suárez, the principal representative of the new Scholasticism associated with the so-called Counter-Reformation. The present reviewer is bound to confess that his own first-hand acquaintance with the work of Ockham is of the slightest and that with the work of Suárez non-existent. He has thus no option but to accept his author's report of their teaching. Fortunately, Fr Copleston is a scholar upon whose learning, judgment and good faith his readers may confidently rely. To William Ockham, whose surname, even if he was not born, as he probably was, at Ockham in Surrey, must surely, notwithstanding what Fr Copleston observes on p. 43, have been derived from that or some other place (if there be one) of the same name, six chapters out of the twenty-four into which this volume is divided are devoted. It is pointed out that we know little of the man apart from his writings; did we know more, we might, as Fr Copleston suggests, find a greater unity than is at first sight obvious between the two phases of his activity, as the leader of a school of nominalistic philosophy at Oxford and as an ecclesiastical statesman, seeking to limit the overweening pretensions of the papacy by the establishment of a General Council, to which it should be subject. In the latter capacity he appears as the opponent of irresponsible power, in the former he is inclined to see in the obligations of the moral law the expression of an arbitrary divine

will rather than of eternal principles intrinsic to the divine nature. The starting-point of his political philosophy was no doubt (as Fr Copleston indicates) the traditional Franciscan doctrine of evangelical poverty which a pope had condemned as heretical; but in the second he is also faithful to the doctrine of the primacy of the will over the intellect, characteristic of the Franciscan philosopher Scotus, to whose realistic doctrine of universals he was notwithstanding strongly opposed; and, as Fr Copleston puts it (p. 48), it was "one of Ockham's main preoccupations as a philosopher to purge Christian theology and philosophy of all traces of Greek necessitarianism, particularly of the theory of essences, which in his opinion endangered the Christian doctrines of the divine liberty and omnipotence". Very probably, as Fr Copleston remarks (p. 111), "he did not clearly realize the difficulties created by his authoritarian conception of morality". On the whole, in Ockham and the nominalists "theology and philosophy were tending to fall apart, but the fact was not clearly recognized" (p. 420). "Ockham's view of nature, taken in isolation from its theological background"—for which "the contingency of relations and of order in nature was seen as the expression of the all-powerful will of God"—"might reasonably be regarded as a stage on the path to a scientific view of nature through the elimination of the metaphysical, but the theological background was not for Ockham himself an irrelevant excrescence" (p. 95). I should like to call special attention to Fr Copleston's clear explanation of the position of Aristotle in the minds of the great Schoolmen. "In the thirteenth century", he rightly says (p. 3), "Aristotelianism meant philosophy itself." "When theologians" at that date "adopted a hostile attitude to Aristotle, they were rejecting philosophy in the name of the Christian faith" (p. 415); while, on the other hand, St Thomas, for whom "philosophy is intrinsically autonomous" (p. 6), "should not be regarded as burdening Christian thought with the system of a particular Greek philosopher"; rather in his acceptance of Aristotelianism he must be understood as recognizing "the rights and position of philosophy as a rational study distinct from theology".

I have already exceeded the space allowed me, and can only very briefly touch upon the rest of the book: far more briefly than it deserves. I have found the chapter on Nicholas of Cusa enlightening and those on the Scientific Movement of the Renaissance and on Francis Bacon excellent. Those on the mystics, though judicious, seem to me less adequate: but one welcomes warmly the decisive rejection of the attempt made by some Germans under the Nazi régime to find in Eckhart the originator of a purely German philosophy of "blood and race". Boehme, I think, is somewhat underrated by our author. It may be thought that to Suárez and the neo-Scholasticism of which he is the principal representative a greater importance is attributed than is their due; but they are no doubt too often ignored, and it is well to have attention called to them and to their influence on contemporary thought.

Fr Copleston rightly emphasizes the importance of this theological

background to the thinkers of the age which he is describing; and in recognizing that theology is a science—the science, as it has been called, of religious experience—there is no more inconsistency with acknowledgment of the freedom and autonomy of philosophy than in recognizing that ethics and aesthetics are capable of scientific treatment. But it is less clear that this freedom and autonomy are not imperilled by the affirmation that there exists anywhere a *magisterium* guaranteed to be infallible, which can impose dogmas the truth of which cannot be matter of discussion. Though, however, Fr Copleston would presumably make this affirmation, he does not do so in this book, so perhaps it is unnecessary to raise the point here. On p. 302 for *Atlanta* read *Atalanta*; on p. 331 *have* for *gave*. And surely on p. 91 l. 16 *Aristotelian* must be a misprint for *Augustinian*.

CLEMENT C. J. WEBB.

THE EARLY EVANGELICALS: A RELIGIOUS AND SOCIAL STUDY. By L. E. Elliott-Binns. Lutterworth Press. 31s. 6d.

THE EVANGELICALS AT OXFORD 1735–1871. By J. S Reynolds. Blackwell. 25s.

Canon C. H. Smyth's Birkbeck Lectures *Simeon and Church Order* awakened a new interest in the origins and development of the Evangelical Movement. In recent years there have been published two first-class biographies of John Newton and Hannah More, an able regional study of the Movement in Cornwall, a small biography of Grimshaw, and we are promised studies of the Venns, Biddulph and Haweis. Nevertheless in spite of this research much work needs to be done in this field, indeed the history of the Evangelical revival in the Anglican Church has still to be written. The gap has, however, been partly filled by these two admirable studies. Dr Elliott-Binns deals with the early years, Mr Reynolds has confined his study to Oxford, and both are most valuable contributions to our knowledge of the Movement.

Canon Smyth wrote that "the history of the Evangelical Revival is essentially a history of personalities rather than of opinions", a statement which is only partially true and which needs modification, for the personalities were bound together by common fundamental convictions which inspired their ministry. One feature of the Revival was the creation of clerical societies in all parts of the country from Truro to Elland which brought together men who had the same basic beliefs and insights, where they discussed theological questions and shared, too, their parochial experiences. It is true that it was not until after the Tractarians were gaining influence that they became conscious of themselves as a party, but even before then, whilst there was considerable variation of opinion amongst them, they had much in common and from time to time united for positive action. Few movements have been so frequently misinterpreted, and these two books rectify many misconceptions. The outstanding value of *The Early Evangelicals* is that we see the Revival against the background of the social and religious history of the late seventeenth and

early eighteenth centuries. The author shows how the Movement developed in the way it did and how it was considerably affected by the environment in which it had its birth. In some ways it was a reaction against the thought-forms and ideas of a barren intellectualism and of a Puritan heritage which had exhausted its vitality in futile controversy. It needs to be stressed that the Evangelical revival was not derived from the Methodist Movement, that its leaders did not consist of those who remained within the Church, and that this was a parallel movement which began in Cornwall and South Wales some years before the conversion of the Wesleys. Some of the leaders were highly critical of the methods adopted by John Wesley, for instance they warned him that his use of lay-preachers would inevitably lead to schism. Nor must the Movement be confused or identified with the Low Church Party: this later liaison, in face of a common fear of Tractarianism, was a disaster of the greatest magnitude.

Dr Elliott-Binns has succeeded in painting a vivid picture of the early years, and his book, the product of much painstaking research, is a most reliable guide to this period. Would that he could be persuaded to continue the story beyond 1789! He traces the rise and progress of the Movement in London, in the universities, in the country. There is a tendency for parts of this to become a monotonous recital of churches where John Wesley preached, but in spite of this every chapter is fascinating and reveals that the ramifications of the Revival were much wider than most of us had suspected. We should like to have had additional information about some of the leaders, particularly Haweis, and even though Basil Woodd's ministry lies in the main beyond this period it is tantalizing to have him dismissed in one line, and there is the surprising omission of any reference to Isaac Crouch of St Edmund Hall. There are valuable chapters on Evangelical Methods, Doctrines, Achievements, and no movement could have had a more sympathetic observer. He gives a masterly assessment of its strength and weakness. Often the early Evangelicals have been criticized for their narrowness and rigidity and for their failure to be true to the spirit of Anglicanism. The author reminds us that "the zeal and energy they exhibited have been exceeded by no other body of Christians, save those who first proclaimed the Gospel message". Their main weaknesses were their intense individualism and their comparative neglect of theology which was to impoverish the Movement in its later years and which explains its consequent failure to make a far more formative contribution to the life of the Church. I question the writer's judgment that they were careless about the conduct of worship: men like Venn, Cecil, Haweis, Robinson, Romaine, in fact, did everything in their power to raise the standard of public worship.

It has always been maintained that Oxford had little sympathy with the Revival and that after the expulsion of the six students from St Edmund Hall in 1768 Cambridge became the centre where Evangelical clergy received their training. Mr Reynolds has shown that this is an unwarranted assumption and that Oxford was a con-

tinuous centre of a small but vigorous Evangelical activity. One of those in residence at the time of the expulsion was Edmund Spencer, who, after becoming rector of Winkfield in 1775, took pupils amongst whom were Isaac Crouch and John Hill, who both became vice-principals of St Edmund Hall. In the years after the expulsion prominent Evangelical leaders were at the university, amongst them being Richard Cecil, William Goode, Basil Woodd, T. T. Biddulph and Robert Hawker. In 1783 Isaac Crouch was appointed vice-principal of St Edmund Hall, and a new era of Oxford Evangelicalism was opened, for it was he who established the Movement on a firm basis. Before the end of the eighteenth century St John's under the influence of John Natt and George Gleed began to be a centre of Evangelical influence. When Macbride became Principal of Magdalen Hall, Symons Warden of Wadham, Cotton Provost of Worcester, and Jeune Master of Pembroke, Evangelicalism ceased to be unfashionable.

By 1871 the Evangelical initiative was shifting from the university to the city parishes and by the formation of the Oxford Evangelical Trust the problem of parochial continuity was solved. Mr Reynolds shows that the secession of Newman had a considerable effect on Evangelical families, and with the great tradition fostered by Simeon Cambridge became increasingly the centre where they sent their sons to be trained for the ministry.

In this most interesting and illuminating study it has been proved beyond any doubt that, contrary to the generally held opinion, Oxford remained after 1768 the centre of a small but vital Evangelical life. Many of them were distinguished men, thirty-three of them became bishops, six of them deans, eleven were Bampton lecturers, and the laymen included such national figures as the second Earl of Harrowby, the seventh Lord Shaftesbury, the first Lord Bexley. The author has written a most readable book which has the merit of being attractively printed. It will long remain an indispensable source-book.

Certain minor corrections should be made before a second edition of *The Early Evangelicals* appears. On p. 135 the dates have been mixed; on p. 191 the quotation from C. Wesley's Journal is not given correctly; p. 291, D. Rowlands was curate and not vicar of Llangeitho; p. 305, add to the footnote James Johnson, *Memoirs of the Rev. David Simpson,* Macclesfield, 1878; p. 416, a hymn of C. Wesley is atrributed to Toplady; p. 346, the first children's hymn book is not Hawker's but *Songs, Divine and Moral* by Isaac Watts for Lady Abney's three young daughters, 1715.

A striking omission from the *Biographical Appendix* of *The Evangelicals at Oxford* is Francis J. Chavasse.

LIVERPOOL. GWYN ROGERS.

SPIRITUAL LETTERS. By Father Hughson. Mowbrays. 15s.

This collection of letters and excerpts has been received with considerable enthusiasm. It has been compared with the letters of St

Francis de Sales, Fénelon, and other spiritual classics. The comparison is just and the book is to be highly recommended. Perhaps the comparison is more apt in the fact that every complete letter in this book, with one insignificant exception, is addressed to a woman. This does not detract from the value of its spiritual counsel, however, for either sex, any more than do the letters of St Francis and Fénelon to women.

Type and set-up are excellent. There are three main groups of letters and excerpts, but it is possible to read at will without appreciable loss. Much of the spiritual advice both deserves the appreciation of the spiritually advanced and can be read with profit by the simple Christian. The letters, in their freshness and simplicity, should also appeal to the newly converted intellectual.

Much of the advice we have heard many times before, but Father Hughson presents it in clear and simple language in a modern dress. "One learned to know God and through this knowledge acquired a real knowledge of self", he says. We have been taught that is the right order, though many little books of piety do, in fact, reverse it. "Do not let Satan tempt you to be in a hurry about anything." "Not infrequently it is the will of God that we remain in perplexity. It is often our pride that makes us want to do something right now." "One must be prepared in contemplation to find much more distraction than in meditation. The latter is an intellectual exercise." Of the emotions: "We must use them and not be used by them."

The supreme importance of prayer is his common theme. "If prayer is the all-important thing, why is there so much strenuous objection to people spending their entire life in what we all agree is the most important thing? Activity, I fear, makes us all feel very important." "Only in religious things are we apt to forget that one of the wisest discoveries the modern world has made is that the best work is done through specialization."

His remarks on the Sacrament of Penance will come as somewhat of a shock to those who were brought up on Bicknell's *Thirty-nine Articles*. You will find "your confessions will seem as normal a part of your spiritual life and routine as your communions, and that is the way it ought to be". "Frequent absolution makes us very sensitive of the approach of sin." "I often wonder if we do not have too much 'counsel' in the confessional" which clouds "the immediate issue which is to get absolution for our sins, and the grace of a special nature which that particular sacrament brings, and which no other can bring".

Father Hughson gives us his knowledge and experience without making us feel we are reading the work of a scholar or listening to a schoolmaster. The secret of his simplicity lies in the fact that he was a contemplative at heart. *Corda in Caelo* and *Fundamentals of the Religious State* give us an insight into two diverse aspects of his mind. The present book shows they are complementary.

B. M. Oman.

Tunbridge Wells.

SHORTER NOTICES

IDEALISTIC THOUGHT IN INDIA. By P. T. Raju. Allen and Unwin. 42s.

ASPECTS OF BUDDHISM. By Henri de Lubac. Sheed and Ward. 12s. 6d.

These two books are interesting in contrast to one another. Father de Lubac is a French Jesuit, Dr Raju a Hindu Professor. De Lubac writes with Gallic clarity an essay of 183 pages, Raju fills more than 450 pages, covering the whole vast field of Indian metaphysics including a number of contemporary thinkers and also a survey of the Idealist tradition in the West. One dares to question the sweeping assertion that the history of philosophy is the history of idealism or that every philosophy is idealistic. That Idealism is the dominant Indian philosophy cannot be denied and the tradition is being richly carried on in modern times. This is shown clearly enough in recent times by such thinkers as Tagore and Aurobindo and such expositors as Radhakrishnan. Whether Dr Raju is right in including Gandhi in his list may be open to doubt, though he certainly makes out a case. As long as the Vedantist tradition survives Indian Idealism will continue and even gain western support. And this detailed study of its metaphysical basis will be found valuable by students.

Catholics have always been able to look for truths in natural religion which point to Christ as well as being able to examine the errors which may blind the most sensitive minds to the Gospel. There are many who cannot find themselves at ease in the orthodoxy of either Hinduism or Christianity, but find in Buddhism a powerful appeal, but we have to be careful in our approach. De Lubac is admirably equipped for such a study. He has profound scholarship; the rare gift of intellectual generosity, and a living faith that saves him from mere academicism. He gives the fullest possible weight to Buddhist "Maitri" without failing to see where it differs from the Christian Agape, and the difference is rooted in its Impersonality. Buddhist ethics are so absolutist as to lose their roots in history and to proliferate with myth.

Thinkers like Aurobindo have tried to depart from the negations of classical Indian thought and to work out a new conception of the superman, and Gandhi tried to relate religious ethics to politics, but the absolutism of Indian thought always has the effect of distortion and it tends to lose grip on reality. As de Lubac points out, "One must be suspicious of any attitude from which the Universe tends to be regarded as nothing more than one vast illusion: such an attitude would be a remarkable betrayal of Christianity, annihilating its very substance and making it simply one aspect . . . of an amorphous mysticism of the Void . . . the danger which comes to us from India."

Christianity is not committed to any philosophy, and it is highly doubtful whether any form of Idealism can really be a basis for an Incarnational religion. Any suggestion that there can be a "united

front" of religions against "the common enemy" of secularism and materialism is most dangerous. There may be Christian insights in materialist philosophy of less danger to the faith than the insidious attractions of Idealism and any mysticism of the Absolute.

LEONARD M. SCHIFF.

EDUCATION INTO RELIGION. By A. Victor Murray. Nisbet. 14s.

The author says that this book is a "discussion of the nature of Education when its goal is religion". Such a claim courts criticism that would hardly do the book justice, for the chapters (apart from their headings) are randomly selective, the thought seems insufficiently controlled and detached for such a theme, and it does not seem to speak from a full, sustained, practical experience. Yet certainly the book offers something; it is, in effect, largely a personal book, revealing the author's cherished ideas, likes and dislikes, frustrations and foibles, but bringing into the foreground important stress on the danger of over-intellectualizing religious education and on the weakness of direct propaganda as a means to "the goal of religion". On these matters Mr Murray has plenty to say and says it with lively illustration and vividness of phraseology which gives enjoyment to the reader.

That many will not agree with his conception of the Church does not weaken the infection of his enthusiasm nor blunt the pointedness of his frequent "sudden sally". Though at times there is "chatter over stony ways" and "bicker down a valley"—as, for example, in flogging the dead horse of faculty psychology and potting at the crows that are bound to hover near educational fields—yet what remains after reading the book is a series of patches which genuinely "sparkle out among the fern", for one finds constant point and stimulation as the pages are pursued. More than this, there is vitality—"something there", as the phrase goes, however elusive.

It is this consciousness of a "something", together with much elusiveness, which complicates the reviewer's task. There is an almost passionate perception of the importance of wise education of the emotions if children are to grow in true religion; yet, straightaway, need to interpret the "wise" and "true" drives one to seek a firmer pursuit of thought and more evidence of sustained experience than the book offers. The importance of this aspect of the subject and the sensitivity of some of the writing make one wish that the author had deepened and controlled more closely his channel of thought.

If its patches of kaleidoscopic vividness and point stir readers to further thought, and some to a revision of their attitude to religious education, the book will fulfil the author's desire—one shared by many who will not agree with all he says.

It may be added that the general reader will not find it an easy book, for important words and phrases (e.g. "the historical method") are used considerably earlier than their intended meaning is given.

E. M. VERINI.

LONDON.

THE THIRD WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER. Edited by O. S. Tomkins. S.C.M. Press. 21s.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE SEVENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGREGATIONAL COUNCIL. Independent Press. 15s.

THE MEANING OF ECUMENICAL. By W. A. Visser 't Hooft. S.C.M. Press. 2s.

For us who were not there, "Lund 1952" comes alive in Dr Tomkins' verbatim reporting. We cannot take part in the worship or enjoy the fellowship. But we share the impact of the opening sermons. We overhear the brilliance of Dr Hodgson's essay in theological reconciliation and the touch of authority with which he sets the conference to work. We sense the dignity of Archbishop Athenagoras. We enter into Prof. Donald Baillie's reminder that as John the Baptist's call to repentance preceded the coming of the Incarnate Christ, so penitential preparation should precede the Holy Communion.

But to continue would be to catalogue the conference rather than to review the report. When it comes to the discussions, we can enter into them too. If we are spared the tiresome confessional recapitulations, we may enjoy the sturdy protests to which they provoked the (present) Bishop of Durham (p. 262). We may take it for granted nowadays that the younger churches make their due contribution (e.g. p. 310), but can rejoice that the younger members also play their part (e.g. p. 56).

But why start with the "Report to the Churches"? In his preface Dr Tomkins alludes to, but does not altogether justify, this departure from the chronological order. Was it that in its proper place the report might prove an anticlimax? We learn of "great restraint on the part of those of us who, in this direction or that, would have liked to see more positive recommendations to action" (p. 12). And indeed it is admitted that the recommendations are in part a rehash of Edinburgh 1937 (p. 34). It is as if the ecumenical armies mounted a successful invasion in the twenties and thirties; and it is only now that they are deployed before the massive bastions of confessional disagreement and parochial apathy. The theological ammunition is at hand and the theological brass-hats are in strength. What is needed for the break-through to the plains beyond is the troops on the ground in the parishes, in the congregations. "Should not our churches . . . act together in all matters except those in which deep differences of conviction compel them to act separately?" (p. 16). It is fitting that this, perhaps the fundamental challenge of the report, should have originated with its editor (p. 170).

Awareness of the ecumenical context dominates the "Proceedings of the Seventh International Congregational Council". Dr Leiper develops Dr Hodgson's suggestion at Lund that "organic" and "covenanted" unity are not mutually exclusive. Dr Visser 't Hooft speaks on the work of the World Council. Dr Berry refers to Dr Goodall's pamphlet, "Congregationalism Plus", a summary of Congregationalist opinion and experience of membership of united

churches. Dr Horton claims a "new Catholic sense of our own past", and Dr Cooke a "more catholic conception of the church" than the Anglicans. Recipients of this stroke will rejoice that this intention of catholicity is consistently matched by a condemnation of isolationism. Mr Huxtable (and others by implication) still treats unkindly the idea of "taking episcopacy into our system". Yet Dr Stafford from the United States can say: "In official function during their terms our Superintendents are bishops. And frankly I do not see how our Churches, once having had them, could get along without them." Your reviewer is agreeably reminded that in his present location it is the "Congregationalists Plus" who already appear as the staunchest upholders of episcopacy.

In the Burge Memorial Lecture (1953) Dr Visser 't Hooft traces "The Meaning of Ecumenical" from Herodotus to Söderblom. The main route is via the LXX, the New Testament, and the Greek Fathers. Already in the latter the word developed from the geographical meaning of the inhabited earth, through a political phase which identifies it with the Empire, to the ecclesiastical connotation of universal validity, which is the key to the understanding of the revival of the word in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. "The ecumenical faith is not the common denominator of what anyone at any time has believed, but the faith which was once delivered to the saints" (p. 28). But may we not hope that the geographical and political overtones are not being entirely lost? It must remain the hope of Archbishop Söderblom's "ecumenical revival" (p. 24) that the "gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the whole Oikoumene" (Mt. 24. 14).

A. H. Dammers.

Bangalore.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

Blackwell: J. C. Dancy, *A Commentary on I Maccabees* (18s.).

Edinburgh House Press: Felicia Komai, *Cry, the Beloved Country*. A Verse Drama (4s.).

Éditions de Chevetogne: A. Baumstark, *Liturgie Comparée* [3rd edition] (165 Fr. B. or 1,150 Fr. F.).

Eyre and Spottiswoode: E. E. Y. Hales, *Pio Nono* (25s.).

Faber and Faber: James Laver, *The First Decadent—Being the Strange Life of J. K. Huysmans* (25s.); Philip Spencer, *Politics of Belief in Nineteenth-Century France* (25s.).

Heinemann: K. Nott, *The Emperor's Clothes* (18s.).

Hodder and Stoughton: Sibyl Harton, *Stars Appearing: lives of sixty-eight Saints of the Anglican Calendar* (12s. 6d.).

Longmans: H. Blamires, *The Devil's Hunting Grounds* (8s. 6d.).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LTD.
GUILDFORD AND LONDON